CONTRACTING FOR A & E SERVICES

CLASSROOM EXERCISES

FEDERAL ACQUISITION INSTITUTE

CURRICULUM OF PROCUREMENT
TRAINING COURSES

CURRENT THROUGH
FAC 90-26

OFFICE OF ACQUISITION POLICY

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

CLASSROOM EXERCISE CE-2.2

"THE PLAYERS"

Time: 30 minutes to prepare
20 minutes to present

Method: **Group Exercise**

Purpose: Enforcement of learning how the planning team members play various roles at specific times, sometimes taking the lead, and sometimes providing support. Flexibility is needed. Understanding when to play what role is necessary. Teamwork and cooperation is essential.

Introduction: The exercise is found on the following page. Note that there are two columns on the far left which are blank, and one column which describes the activity (steps) in the procurement cycle.

Instructions for Students:

At the bottom of the page there are listed typical department or division personnel which would be involved in planning an A-E procurement. Using the codes provided next to the described departments, identify in

Column #1 who has the lead in each activity, and in

Column #2 who has supportive roles.

Keep in mind that there may be more than one person who would have supporting roles, and in some instances more than one in the lead.

Also bear in mind that different agencies have different policies regarding who does what. Therefore, there probably will not be total agreement within your group. These variances should be brought out by the group appointed spokesperson at the end of the exercise during the discussion period.

Then in Column #3, after discussing within your group, put a timeframe for doing the activity.

4. Performance Objectives. (What are the criteria against which we will judge the effectiveness of the effort?)

5. Period of Performance. (How long do we have to complete the job or how long do we think it will take to complete the work?)

6. Special Reporting Requirements. (Are special or interim reports or meetings with the customer or others (e.g., EPA) required?)

7. Government Furnished Information, Equipment or Assistance (Will any significant information, equipment or assistance be provided to the contractor to the extent that this will affect the schedule or price of the task?)

B. PLAN OF ACTION

1. Proposed Acquisition Source. (In-house, contractor, small business, 8(a) set aside, supplemental agreement).

2. Competition. (Will this be a competitive or non-competitive procurement as defined in the FAR?)

☐ Yes ☐ No

A-E FEE PROPOSAL

PROJECT TITLE: SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION
LOCATION: ANY TOWN, USA
NAME OF FIRM: SMITH/SMITH & ASSOC.
CONTRACT NUMBER:
ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION COST: $2,350,000

SECTION A: DESIGN

	NO. OF DRAWINGS	EST. NO OF HOURS	HOURLY RATE	TOTAL ESTIMATED COST
ITEM 1				
A. PROJECT ENGINEER		214	30.50	6527.00
B. ARCHITECT	10	248	27.05	6708.00
DRAFTSMAN		300	14.00	4200.00
C. STRUCTURAL ENGINEER	4	160	28.80	4608.00
DRAFTSMAN		106	14.00	1486.00
D. MECHANICAL ENGINEER	9	155	28.05	4348.00
DRAFTSMAN		132	14.82	1956.00
E. ELECTRICAL ENGINEER	5	165	26.95	4447.00
DRAFTSMAN		144	14.00	2016.00
F. CIVIL ENGINEER	7	168	26.05	4376.00
DRAFTSMAN		154	14.00	2156.00
G. LANDSCAPE ARCH. DRAFT.				
H. OTHER	3	16	14.00	224.00
TOTAL ITEM 1	38	16	14.00	**43,052.00**
ITEM 2				
A. SPEC/REPORT WRITER		170	21.00	3570.00
B. TYPIST		200	12.50	2500.00
C. OTHER		40	9.50	380.00
TOTAL ITEM 2				**6450.00**
ITEM 3				
A. COST EST. ENGINEER		84	23.00	**1932.00**

TOTAL DIRECT COST (ITEMS 1,2,3)	**$51,434.00**
OVERHEAD (G&A): 153 % X $51,434 = $78,694.02	$78,694.00
PROFIT: 9.8 % X ($51,434+$78,694) = $12,763	$12,763.00

TOTAL THIS SIDE NOT TO EXCEED 6% OF ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION COST	**DESIGN TOTAL** (DIRECT COST + G&A + PROFIT)	$ **132,891.00**

PREPARED BY: _____ DATE: JUNE 20, 199x

QUESTIONNAIRE

After reviewing the proposal submitted by the A-E, answer the following questions:

1. After reviewing the proposal, do you believe that the A-E thoroughly understands the scope?

   YES ___ NO ___

   Explain: _____

   _____

   _____

2. How would you generally classify this project as to risk?

   _____ Simple
   _____ Difficult
   _____ Routine
   _____ Very complex

3. What about period of performance? Is there risk involved?

   YES ___ NO ___

   Explain:

   _____

   _____

4. What is the contract type? _____

5. Are there any mathematical errors?

   YES ___ NO ___

6. In comparing the number of drawings and estimate of hours, do the figures match when compared with the scope?

   YES ___ NO ___

QUESTIONNAIRE (Cont.)

7. Using the information provided concerning the Government General Wage Rates and comparing the figures to the A-E's proposal, do the wages under Section A. Design seem reasonable?

   YES ___ NO ___

8. Review the listing on the Overhead Analysis form. Identify any unallowables or questionable items.

   _____ _____ _____
   _____ _____ _____
   _____ _____ _____
   _____ _____ _____
   _____ _____ _____
   _____ _____ _____

9. Does the overhead rate of 153% appear to the reasonable?

   YES ___ NO ___

10. Will a cost and price certification be required at the conclusion of negotiations?

    YES ___ NO ___

11. Is an audit required?

    YES ___ NO ___

12. Does the A-E proposal exceed the 6% Fee limitation?

    _____

GENERAL & ADMINISTRATIVE

MOST A-Es LUMP THEIR

OVERHEAD

INTO THE SAME COST POOL

AS THEIR

G&A.

VG 4-12

CERTIFICATION OF COSTS

1.	**THRESHOLD**	**$500,000**
2.	**TO SUBMIT**	**USE OF SF 1411**
3.	**CERTIFY DATA**	**ACCURATE, COMPLETE, CURRENT**

FACTUAL COSTS VS JUDGMENTAL COSTS

VG 4-13

6 % FEE

The 6% statutory fee limitation applies only to the DESIGN services portion of the A-E's proposal:

- **Working Drawings**
- **Specifications**
- **Construction Cost Estimate**

VG 4-14

FIRM E

Qualifications of the people assigned to do the work.

Lucky/Hightower is a medium sized architectural firm with a professional and technical staff of over ninety. We have a diversified practice designing both commercial and institutional work. Approximately half of the staff are registered architects and half of the remaining technical staff are architects-in-training. Because we have a diversified practice our staff has the advantage of working on both meticulous commissary projects and cost-conscious commercial developments. That experience helps to broaden our personnel, and it brings commercial cost efficiency considerations to military work. We pride ourselves on the quality and thoroughness of our construction documents and organization and management skills.

Mr. Lucky is a "working principal" and will have overall responsibility for your project and be intimately involved in all phases of the project. He will be the contact for Lucky/Hightower as he has been for all our previous commissary projects.

Mrs. Pat Davis will be the Project Manager. Mrs. Davis is a Vice President and has been associated with the firm for the past twelve years. Both Mrs. Davis and Mr. Lucky have had extensive military experience and both have been in charge of all of the firm's commissary and cafeteria projects.

The consultants to be used on your project have a long standing working relationship with our firm and their personnel have produced six commissaries and/or cafeterias as a team. All of the consultants have had extensive governmental experience, and our management brings them together into a well organized and effective team. The same basic team will be dedicated to your project.

For projects not within our immediate locality, it has been our firm's policy to select consultants whose knowledge of the project areas is critical in rendering their professional services. We will associate with local firms in the fields of soil and geotechnical engineering, civil engineering, and landscape architecture.

Recent experience of our people in food preparation facilities, including cold storage areas, parking lots and demolition of existing structures.

Lucky/Hightower and Associates specializes in the design of cafeterias, commissaries and commercial supermarkets -- we have designed new commissaries and major renovations to over twenty DoD commissaries. The firm has a thorough knowledge and understanding of design criteria for these facilities, including the specialized requirements for refrigeration, heat recovery, and energy conservation. In 1988, we prepared for the United States Air Force Commissary Service on our CADD system a set of commissary standards which are now used as definitive criteria for new facilities.

We have a major mainframe CADD system with a data bank of commissary, cafeteria, and supermarket construction document information.